

PATENT

KERMANI 43  
Y0242-00205**Remarks**

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-16, 18-19, 22-23, 25-26, 28-38 are pending in the present application. Applicants have cancelled Claims 33-36, added new Claims 39-42 and amended Claims 1, 19, 16, 23, 37 and 38.

The Action rejects all pending claims. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following arguments.

**I. Claim Rejection Under § 103**

The Action rejects all pending claims as being obvious under U.S. Patent No. 6,289,304 to Grefenstette (hereinafter, Grefenstette) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,789,230 to Katariya, et al. (hereafter, Katariya). This rejection is addressed below using amended Claim 1 as representative of independent Claims 9, 16 and 23.

The amendments set for the above do not add new subject matter and find ample support in the Specification at, for example, FIG. 4 and Page 7, Line 16-Page 9, Line 29.

Amended Claim 1 is now directed to an embodiment where the user can select from a plurality of different abstracted versions of the electronic document that can be created. Once the user has selected an abstracted version to be created, a set of instructions corresponding to the electronic document is executed to create the version selected by the user. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the instructions are customized to the electronic document before the user makes his/her selection of the abstracted version to be created. In the claimed embodiment, the customization comprises a plurality of weights pre-assigned to respective portions of the electronic document to enable creation of the plurality of versions of the electronic document.

Put another way, a set of instructions exists that has been customized to the electronic document (e.g., weights have been pre-assigned to each portion of the document) before the user selects a version of the document to be created. Assigning different weights to respective

PATENT

KERMANI 43  
Y0242-00205

portions of the electronic document allows for creation of multiple versions of the electronic document. Executing the instructions in a first manner produces a first version of the electronic document. Executing the instructions in a second manner produces a second version of the electronic document, and so on. The user is allowed to pick from several different versions of the electronic document, which can be created by executing the instructions in a manner that corresponds to the abstracted version selected by the user.

As conceded by the Examiner, Grefenstette only teaches generic instructions that are not customized in anyway to the electronic document, and certainly not customized before any selection by a user of an abstracted version to be created. Katariya discloses a method and system for generating a summary of a document that uses a first algorithm to calculate a weight for each of the sentences in a document and then uses a second algorithm to generate a summary of the "selected sentences such that the selected sentences are ordered in the created summary in the same relative order as in the document." (See Katariya, col. 3, line 55-67). Specifically, Katariya assigns a weight to a sentence based on the term frequency of a component term. (See Katariya, col. 5, line 20-25). In FIG. 2 of Katariya, the summary algorithm then evaluates each possible set of eligible sentences and selects the set of sentences whose length is less than the maximum length set for the summary and whose total weight is the greatest. In steps 202-211, each sentence of a document is examined to determine whether the binary length of the sentence is greater than the maximum allowed length (step 209) and whether the weight of the sentence is greater than the maximum sentence weight (step 210). The process loop is carried out until all sentences of a given document have been examined (step 203).

In summary, any algorithm executed by Katariya after the sentences are assigned weights allows for the creation of **only one summary version** of the document because the algorithm operates in the same manner each time, with respect to a given document, to create an abstracted document that does not exceed a pre-defined length.

## PATENT

KERMANI 43  
Y0242-00205

The method for abstracting documents disclosed by Katariya does not teach or suggest the step of creating the abstracted version of the electronic document selected by the user from a plurality of abstracted versions of the electronic document that could be selected by the user to be created. It follows that that Katariya does not teach or suggest a set of instructions that are customized to the electronic document before the user selects the abstracted version to be created where the customization includes a plurality of weights that are pre-assigned to respective portions of the electronic document to enable creation of the plurality of abstracted versions of the electronic document.

From the foregoing, the combination of Grefenstette and Katariya does not teach or suggest the prompting and creating steps of amended Claim 1. It follows that independent Claim 1, and independent Claims 9, 16 and 23, which recite features that parallel Claim 1, are not obvious from Grefenstette in view of Katrina, and are therefore allowable over the art of record. It is submitted that Claims 3-8, 11-15, 18-19, 22, 25-26 and 28-32, which depend from the independent claims, are also allowable for at least the reasons set forth above. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims are respectfully requested.

Applicant has also amended independent Claims 37-38. The prompting step of Claim 37 has been amended in the same manner as Claim 1. The creating step of Claim 37 has also been amended to recite that the set of instructions comprises an assignment of individual weights from a plurality of weights to respective portions of the electronic document, wherein each abstracted version from the plurality of versions of the electronic document (i.e., the plurality of versions of the electronic document that could be created and from which the user selected the particular abstracted version to be created) is associated with a respective subset of the individual weights from the plurality of assigned weights. The amended creating step further recites that the instruction executing step comprises comparing a subset of individual weights associated with the selected abstracted version to the weights assigned to the electronic document to remove portions of the electronic document.

PATENT

KERMANI 43  
Y0242-00205

It is submitted that Katariya, which teaches a methodology which can create only a single version of an electronic document, neither teaches nor suggests using assigned weights for portions of the electronic document in a manner that enables creation of a plurality of different versions of the electronic document, and creating a particular version of the electronic document selected by the user by comparing a subset of the individual weights associated with the selected version to the weights pre-assigned to the respective portions of electronic document to remove portions of the electronic document. Put another way, Katariya does not teach a methodology where subsets of weights assigned to an electronic document are each associated with different versions of the electronic document that can be created.

For at least these reasons, it follows that independent Claim 37 and independent Claim 38, which recites features that parallel Claim 37, are not obvious from Grefenstette in view of Katariya, and are therefore allowable over the art of record. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims are respectfully requested.

## II. New Claims

New Claims 39-42 have been added, examination of which are respectfully requested.

New Claims 39 and 41 recite that the executing step comprises identifying a subset of said plurality of weights, said subset associated with the abstracted version to be created, and removing portions of said electronic document based on said subset. As discussed above, the methodology of Katariya allows for creation of only a single version of an electronic document. It follows that Katariya does not identify a subset of weights that are "associated with the abstracted version to be created" where, as defined in the independent claims, the abstracted version to be created is selectable from a plurality of possible versions that could be selected by the user to be created. For at least this reason, it is submitted that Claims 39 and 41 are independently allowable over the art of record.

PATENT

KERMANI 43  
Y0242-00205

New Claims 40 and 42 recite that, prior to the prompting step, the user selects a set of instructions for abstracting the electronic document from a plurality of sets of instructions for abstracting the electronic document. Importantly, each of said instructions is customized, before selection thereof, to the electronic document and each of the sets of instructions is configured to enable creation of a plurality of different abstracted versions of the electronic document. As shown in FIG. 1, multiple customized instruction sets can exist for selection by the user. For example, different persons could each create a different set of instructions for abstracting an electronic document (e.g., a scientific article). Each person can have a different opinion of how respective portions of the electronic document can be grouped to create multiple different abstracted versions of the electronic document. Each person could make his or her particular instruction set available on his or her respective server, for example. The user can then locate one of these instruction sets. After locating and selecting the instruction set, the user is prompted to select one of the possible versions of the electronic document that can be created using the selected set of instructions and the version is created. Such a system and method is very flexible and allows for any number of instructions sets to be created by any number of individuals. Certainly, no such system is taught or suggested by the art of record. For at least these reasons, it is submitted that Claims 40 and 42 are independently allowable over the art of record.

PATENT

KERMANI 43  
Y0242-00205


**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance at an early date, which action is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any excess payment that may be associated with this communication to deposit account 04-1679.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 1/19/05

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Joseph A. Powers, Reg. No.: 47,006  
Attorney For Applicant

DUANE MORRIS LLP  
One Liberty Place  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103-7396  
(215) 979-1842 (Telephone)  
(215) 979-1020 (Fax)